IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA EASTERN DIVISION No. 4:22-cv-116

EDWIN TARLEY, JR., and EPHRAIM WREH, Each Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

PLAINTIFFS

VS.

ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALTIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

DEFENDANT

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT—COLLECTIVE ACTION

Plaintiffs Edwin Tarley, Jr., and Ephraim Wreh (collectively "Plaintiffs"), each individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through undersigned counsel, for their Original Complaint—Collective Action ("Complaint") against Defendant Environmental Specialties International, Inc. ("Defendant"), state and allege as follows:

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

- 1. This is a collective action brought by Plaintiffs, each individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, against Defendant for violations of the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. (the "FLSA").
- 2. Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment, monetary damages, liquidated damages, prejudgment interest, and a reasonable attorney's fee and costs as a result of Defendant's policy and practice of failing to pay proper overtime wages under the FLSA.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina has subject matter jurisdiction over this suit under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1331

because this suit raises federal questions under the FLSA.

4. The acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in the Eastern

Division of this District. Therefore, venue is proper within the Eastern Division pursuant to

28 U.S.C. § 1391.

III. THE PARTIES

5. Plaintiff Edwin Tarley, Jr. ("Tarley"), is an individual and resident of Clark

County, Nevada.

6. Plaintiff Ephraim Wreh ("Wreh") is an individual and resident of Escambia

County, Florida.

7. Defendant is a foreign for-profit corporation

8. Defendant's registered agent for service of process is Darrell Ray Phillips

at 1929 Sweetwater Road, Robbinsville, North Carolina 28771.

9. Defendant maintains a website at https://esiliners.com/.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10. Defendant employs two or more individuals who engage in interstate

commerce or business transactions, or who produce goods to be transported or sold in

interstate commerce, or who handle, sell, or otherwise work with goods or materials that

have been moved in or produced for interstate commerce such as vehicles and fuel.

11. Defendant's annual gross volume of sales made or business done is not

less than \$500,000.00 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level that are separately

stated) in each of the three years preceding the filing of the Original Complaint.

12. At all times material herein, Plaintiffs have been entitled to the rights,

protections, and benefits provided under the FLSA.

13. At all times material herein, Plaintiffs have been classified by Defendant as

nonexempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207, and have been

paid an hourly rate.

14. Defendant employed each Plaintiff within the three years preceding the filing

of this Complaint.

Specifically, Defendant employed Tarley as an hourly-paid Liner Technician 15.

from March of 2022 until May of 2022.

16. Defendant employed Wreh as an hourly-paid Forklift Operator from March

of 2022 until May of 2022.

17. Plaintiffs worked at Defendant's facilities in South Aurora.

18. Plaintiffs' direct supervisor was Peter Ochse.

19. Within the three years preceding the filing of this Complaint, Defendant also

employed other hourly-paid employees who performed work necessary to its business

who were supervised by Peter Ochse (hereinafter, "Hourly Employees").

20. At all relevant times herein, Defendant directly hired Plaintiffs and other

Hourly Employees to work on its behalf, paid them wages and benefits, controlled their

work schedules, duties, protocols, applications, assignments and employment conditions,

and kept at least some records regarding their employment.

Page 3 of 11

Edwin Tarley, Jr., et al. v. Environmental Specialties International, Inc.

21. Plaintiffs and other Hourly Employees recorded their hours via Defendant's

electronic timekeeping system.

22. Defendant regularly paid Plaintiffs for fewer hours than they submitted.

23. Peter Ochse regularly clocked out Plaintiffs while they were still working, or

retroactively adjusted Plaintiffs' hours to reflect fewer hours than they actually worked.

24. Upon information and belief, Peter Ochse also regularly clocked out other

Hourly Employees while they were still working or retroactively adjusted their hours to

reflect fewer hours than they actually worked.

25. Due to Defendant's practice of shaving the hours of Plaintiffs and other

Hourly Employees, they worked hours which went uncompensated.

26. Plaintiffs regularly worked hours over 40 in a week.

27. Upon information and belief, other Hourly Employees also regularly or

occasionally worked hours over 40 in a week.

28. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and other Hourly

Employees were working over 40 hours in some weeks.

29. Plaintiffs hours were artificially reduced in weeks in which they also worked

over 40 hours.

30. Upon information and belief, the hours of other Hourly Employees were also

artificially reduced in weeks in which they also worked over 40 hours.

31. At all relevant times herein, Defendant has deprived Plaintiffs and other

Hourly Employees who were supervised by Peter Ochse of compensation for all hours

worked, including an overtime premium of 1.5x their regular hourly rate for all hours

worked over 40 each week.

Page 4 of 11

Edwin Tarley, Jr., et al. v. Environmental Specialties International, Inc.

32. The net effect of Defendant's practices and policies as described above, is

that Defendant intentionally failed to record all of Plaintiffs' time worked in order to avoid

paying them for all hours worked.

33. Defendant made no reasonable efforts to ascertain and comply with

applicable law.

34. Defendant knew or showed reckless disregard for whether its actions

violated the FLSA.

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS V.

35. Plaintiffs bring this claim for relief for violation of the FLSA as a collective

action pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), on behalf of all persons

similarly situated who were, are, or will be employed by Defendant within the applicable

statute of limitations period, who are entitled to payment of the following types of

damages:

Α. Regular wage and overtime premiums for all hours worked over forty in any

week;

B. Liquidated damages; and

C. Attorney's fees and costs.

36. Plaintiffs propose the following class under the FLSA:

> All Hourly Employees who were supervised by Peter Ochse within the past three years.

37. In conformity with the requirements of FLSA Section 16(b), each Plaintiff

has filed or will soon file a written Consent to Join this lawsuit.

38. The relevant time period dates back three years from the date on which

Plaintiffs' Original Complaint—Collective Action was filed herein and continues forward

through the date of judgment pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a), except as set forth herein below.

- 39. The members of the proposed FLSA collective are similarly situated in that they share these traits:
 - A. They were paid hourly;
 - B. They were supervised by Peter Ochse;
 - C. They recorded their time in the same manner;
 - D. They were not paid for all of the hours that they submitted;
- E. They were subject to Defendant's practice of clocking them out while they were still working; and
 - F. They worked more than 40 hours in at least one week in the past 3 years.
- 40. Plaintiffs are unable to state the exact number of the collective but believes that the collective exceeds 15 persons.
- 41. Defendant can readily identify the members of the collective, who are a certain portion of the current and former employees of Defendant.
- 42. The names and physical and mailing addresses of the probable FLSA collective action plaintiffs are available from Defendant.
- 43. The email addresses of many of the probable FLSA collective action plaintiffs are available from Defendant.

VI. FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Individual Claims for FLSA Violations)

44. Plaintiffs assert this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.

45. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an

enterprise engaged in commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.

46. 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207 require any enterprise engaged in commerce to

pay a minimum wage for all hours worked up to 40 each week and to pay 1.5x their regular

wages for all hours worked over 40, unless an employee meets certain exemption

requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 213 and all accompanying DOL regulations.

47. Defendant classified Plaintiffs as nonexempt from the requirements of the

FLSA.

48. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs for all hours worked.

49. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs a sufficient overtime premium for all hours

worked over forty each week.

50. Defendant knew or should have known that its actions violated the FLSA.

51. Defendant's conduct and practices, as described above, were willful.

52. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to

Plaintiffs for monetary damages, liquidated damages and costs, including reasonable

attorney's fees provided by the FLSA for all violations which occurred beginning at least

three years preceding the filing of Plaintiffs' initial complaint, plus periods of equitable

tolling.

53. Defendant has not acted in good faith nor with reasonable grounds to

believe its actions and omissions were not a violation of the FLSA, and, as a result thereof,

Plaintiffs are entitled to recover an award of liquidated damages in an amount equal to

the amount of unpaid overtime premium pay described above pursuant to Section 16(b)

of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

54. Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant acted in good faith in failing to pay Plaintiffs as provided by the FLSA, Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of

prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

VII. SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Collective Action Claim for FLSA Violations)

55. Plaintiffs assert this claim for damages and declaratory relief on behalf of all

similarly situated employees pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.

56. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an

enterprise engaged in commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.

57. 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207 require any enterprise engaged in commerce to

pay all employees a minimum wage for all hours worked up to 40 each week and to pay

1.5x their regular wages for all hours worked over 40, unless an employee meets certain

exemption requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 213 and accompanying DOL regulations.

58. Defendant classified Plaintiffs and other similarly situated employees as

nonexempt from the overtime provisions of the FLSA.

59. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs and similarly situated employees for all

hours worked.

60. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs and similarly situated employees a

sufficient overtime premium for all hours worked over forty each week.

61. Defendant deprived Plaintiffs and similarly situated employees of

compensation for hours worked over forty per week, in violation of the FLSA.

62. Defendant knew or should have known that its actions violated the FLSA.

63. Defendant's conduct and practices, as described above, were willful.

64. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to

Plaintiffs and all similarly situated employees for monetary damages, liquidated damages

and costs, including reasonable attorney's fees provided by the FLSA for all violations

which occurred beginning at least three years preceding the filing of Plaintiffs' initial

complaint, plus periods of equitable tolling.

65. Defendant has not acted in good faith nor with reasonable grounds to

believe its actions and omissions were not a violation of the FLSA, and, as a result thereof,

Plaintiffs and similarly situated employees are entitled to recover an award of liquidated

damages in an amount equal to the amount of unpaid overtime premium pay described

above pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

66. Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant acted in good faith in

failing to pay Plaintiffs and the collective members as provided by the FLSA, they are

entitled to an award of prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiffs Edwin Tarley, Jr., and Ephraim

Wreh, each individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, respectfully pray that

Defendant be summoned to appear and to answer this Complaint and for declaratory

relief and damages as follows:

A. Declaratory judgment that Defendant's practices alleged in this Complaint

violate the FLSA and its related regulations;

B. Certification of a collective under Section 216 of the FLSA of all individuals

similarly situated, as further defined in any motion for the same;

Page 9 of 11

- C. Judgment for damages suffered by Plaintiffs and others similarly situated for all unpaid overtime wages under the FLSA and its related regulations;
- D. Judgment for liquidated damages owed to Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated pursuant to the FLSA and its related regulations;
- E. An order directing Defendant to pay Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated interest, a reasonable attorney's fee and all costs connected with this action; and
 - F. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWIN TARLEY, JR., and EPHRAIM WREH, Each Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, PLAINTIFFS

This 28 day of September 2022.

/s/ Courtney Harness

Courtney Harness

SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC

Kirkpatrick Plaza

10800 Financial Centre Pkwy, Suite 510

Little Rock, Arkansas 72211

Telephone: (501) 221-0088

Facsimile: (888) 787-2040

harness@sanfordlawfirm.com

Mo. Bar No. 56923

Attorney for Plaintiffs

/s/ Josh Sanford

Josh Sanford

SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC

Kirkpatrick Plaza

10800 Financial Centre Pkwy, Suite 510

Little Rock, Arkansas 72211

Telephone: (501) 221-0088

Facsimile: (888) 787-2040

josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

Ark. Bar No. 2001037

Attorney for Plaintiffs

/s/ Janelle L. Cline

Janelle L. Cline CLINE LAW GROUP, PLLC 6329 Oleander Drive Wilmington, North Carolina 28403 Telephone: (910) 661-2012 Facsimile: (910) 338-0557

janelle.cline@clinelawgroupnc.com

State Bar No. 56904

Local Civil Rule 83.1(d) Counsel for Plaintiffs